UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YOR	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
v.	17 CR 243 (SHS)
ARASH KETABCHI,	
Defendant.	
	x
	New York, N.Y. August 30, 2017 3:00 p.m.
Before:	
HON. SI	DNEY H. STEIN,
	District Judge
AP	PEARANCES
JOON H. KIM	
Acting United States At Southern District of Ne	
KIERSTEN A. FLETCHER Assistant United States	Attorney
JAMES R. FROCCARO, JR. Outgoing Attorney for D)ofondant
GARY BECKER	relendant
Incoming Attorney for D)efendant

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: United States v. Arash Ketabchi. 1 Counsel, please state your names for the record. 2 3 MS. FLETCHER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kiersten 4 Fletcher for the government. 5 MR. FROCCARO: Good afternoon. James Froccaro for 6 defendant. 7 THE COURT: Good afternoon. MR. BECKER: Good afternoon. Gary Becker. The Court 8 9 asked me to be here. My CJA duty day was Friday. My 10 understanding is there are conflicts with the lawyers whose 11 duty days are today and tomorrow, so I'm happy to be here. 12 THE COURT: Good afternoon to all of you, and 13 Mr. Ketabchi is present as well. 14 Yes, I have a letter from Mr. Froccaro, which has been 15 filed as ECF Document 67, in which he says that Mr. Ketabchi had recently notified Mr. Froccaro that Mr. Ketabchi's 16 17 financially unable to proceed with private counsel. And he's 18 only been paid a fraction of the modest retainer he was promised, and Mr. Ketabchi has indicated he will not have the 19 20 balance of the retainer. And there has been a breakdown in the 21 attorney-client relationship, necessitating this application. 22 Mr. Froccaro, has your client filled out a CJA 23 23 form? 24 MR. FROCCARO: He has, your Honor.

THE COURT: Pass it up, please.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. FROCCARO: Mr. Becker has it, your Honor. He's 2 going to hand it up. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 Mr. Ketabchi, I have this CJA form 23. Did you fill 5 it out, sir? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Is that your signature? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Let me ask a few questions. It says if 10 married, is your spouse employed, and nothing is filled out. I 11 take it you are not married. Is that correct? THE DEFENDANT: I'm not married. 12 13 THE COURT: Under "other income" you have 3,000 14 employment, 2,000 Uber, and then you say "estimate." And then 15 it says \$20,000 estimated. What does that mean? 16 THE DEFENDANT: In March, when we got the homes raided 17 and they took all my bank statements and they closed all my 18 bank accounts. At that time, prior to that, for the six months 19 I estimate that may be from the business there was 20,000 or so

and they took all my bank statements and they closed all my bank accounts. At that time, prior to that, for the six months I estimate that may be from the business there was 20,000 or so income. And I don't have access to any of that stuff, so I'm not sure exactly what it was. And prior to that, I never filed my tax returns for this year. For -- 2016. I just -- 2017. So I don't know what my income was.

THE COURT: The question asked within the past 12 months, so are you saying you're estimating your income total

THE DEFENDANT: It could be more, but again, I don't have access to it, and haven't file my taxes, so I'm not positive. But in these past six months is where, you know, the important part is moving forward, I don't -- I can't get any sort of job. Everywhere I go, Google is a very dangerous device, and everybody, I work three weeks, a month, and then they come back and they tell me, hey, you know, we can't employ you anymore. Wire fraud, money laundering case. Or they do a background check.

income from August of 2016 to August of 2017 is about \$20,000?

Uber closed my account because of a background check. I can't even drive Uber. I was working with my father in the family business, and he can't afford to keep me anymore and some conflict of relationship stuff.

THE COURT: Is that the 3,000 for employment, is that when you were working for your father?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct. 500 a week, yup.

THE COURT: Uber is when you were a driver for Uber?

THE DEFENDANT: I was. I wish I could drive now, I wish I could get employment.

THE COURT: Then it says do you own any real estate, stocks, bonds, notes, or any other valuable property, and you checked yes. And what you list is a home with a value of 700,000, but you also list AmeriHome as indebtedness of \$560,000.

24

25

I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I gather 1 from what you say here that you believe the value of the home 2 3 you own is \$700,000, but you have a \$560,000 mortgage against 4 the equity. Is that what this indicates? 5 THE DEFENDANT: I believe yes. If I'm -- if I wrote 6 that by accident, may have been 650,000 I owe, not 560. I 7 might have transposed it there. But I didn't pay last month's mortgage payment. I'm behind on last month's mortgage. 8 9 THE COURT: Let me ask it this way. Do you have a 10 mortgage on your home? 11 THE DEFENDANT: I do, sir. 12 THE COURT: What is the mortgage? How much is 13 outstanding on the mortgage? 14 THE DEFENDANT: I believe it's 650. I could call AmeriHome and ask them. 15 THE COURT: If that's your good-faith estimate, that's 16 17 all right. You have to change this affidavit then, because it 18 says 560. 19 THE DEFENDANT: Would you like me to get the exact 20 before I do that? 21 THE COURT: I don't need it. 22 THE DEFENDANT: And your Honor, on that equity on the 23 home, the courts have put \$100,000 cash bond on the home.

I have a \$100,020 lien on the home from a loan, a business loan

I had gotten that I couldn't repay.

25

1 THE COURT: Thank you. Put the correct amount, best 2 of your ability, with the outstanding indebtedness on the 3 mortgage. 4 MR. FROCCARO: Judge, may I hand it up? 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 MR. FROCCARO: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Do you have any other property, apart from the home; stocks, bonds? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Autos? 11 THE DEFENDANT: I lease a vehicle, yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, do you swear under penalty 13 of perjury that the statements you've set forth in this CJA 14 financial affidavit 23 form are true and accurate? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: I'm signing this. I am approving it. 17 is Mr. Froccaro correct in his letter to me that you no longer 18 wish him to be your attorney? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Not that I wish. 20 couldn't afford to pay the rest of the money, so he didn't want 21 to represent me anymore without the money. 22 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to relieve 23 Mr. Froccaro and I'm going to appoint Mr. Becker as your 24 attorney pursuant to the Criminal Justice Act. You will not be

responsible for Mr. Becker's fees or expenses. That will be

paid out of Criminal Justice Act funds.

Mr. Froccaro, I am directing you to turn over the files to Mr. Becker and to assist in all ways in getting up to speed on this matter.

MR. FROCCARO: I will, your Honor. I gave him all the discovery today. If there is anything else Mr. Becker needs, I've known him for years, I'm more than happy to help.

THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, the CJA attorney on duty today and the CJA on duty tomorrow both had conflicts with regard to this case, so I've appointed Mr. Becker as the CJA on duty on Friday.

And Mr. Becker, I believe you know that this case has been set down for trial on April 16, and it will go to trial on that date. And I take it you're able to represent Mr. Arash Ketabchi.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, I don't have any conflicts in April of 2018 or I would have raised them with your Honor's deputy. I'd like to think that between now and April '18 is sufficient time for me to be prepared to go to trial. I understand that co-counsel in this case have had about a six-month head start on me. But barring some unforeseen circumstance in terms of discovery or something, yes, I would be prepared to go to trial in April of 2018.

THE COURT: I'll take that as you are prepared to go to trial in April, barring some unforeseen circumstance.

Is there anything else I need do? Let me sign this order that says that the request of James R. Froccaro, Junior, to be relieved as counsel is hereby ordered that James R. Froccaro, Junior's relieved, and Gary Becker is appointed pursuant to the Criminal Justice Act to assume the representation of Arash Ketabchi.

Government, is there anything else I can do at this point?

MS. FLETCHER: Nothing from the government, thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Becker, is anything at this point I can do for the defense?

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor, two matters. The first concerns the scheduling of motions in this matter. I understand the Court entered an order July 19 scheduling defense motions to be due September 18, which is of course just a little over two and a half weeks from now. And I would ask the Court, in view of the government's representation that the amount of discovery in this case is massive, that I be given at least sufficient time commensurate with the time that the other lawyers in the case were given to review the discovery and make any motions particular to Mr. Ketabchi's matter.

THE COURT: I can't give you the amount of time they've had from the beginning of the case, that's for sure.

But I can extend the September 18 deadline by a couple of weeks

if that's what you're asking.

MR. BECKER: No, your Honor. I was quite frankly asking if the Court would consider extending the deadline to approximately mid November. That would give me a little over two months to review the discovery.

Discovery was provided, I understand, to the other counsel both in June and July. The most recent discovery was July 19. So that gives those counsel a full two months, and they had discovery as early as June, which would give them a full three months.

I don't know how I can possibly review what I'm told by the government is just a massive amount of discovery, including eight search warrants, many of which might implicate Mr. Ketabchi's expectation of privacy and Fourth Amendment rights and just a ton of other documents.

THE COURT: What are you asking for?

MR. BECKER: I'm asking for November 21, your Honor.

THE COURT: I can give you until November 9.

MR. BECKER: Okay. Very well.

THE COURT: The last date is November 9.

MR. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor --

THE COURT: Just a moment.

MR. BECKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Response November 16; reply, if any, November 21 for any motions that relate to Arash Ketabchi.

Yes, sir. What else?

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor. The second matter concerns condition of bail that pertains both to Mr. Ketabchi and I suppose to all the defendants. And I noticed this on the -- I had an opportunity to review the docket entries today. On 4/28/17, when the Court set bail, it imposed as one of the conditions the condition that, quote, the defendants shall not communicate with each -- with other defendants except with their attorneys present.

I saw that, and it struck me, because, quite frankly,

I don't think I've ever seen such a bail condition where

defendants were not allowed to speak with one another. I have

multiple --

THE COURT: They are, but their attorneys have to be present.

MR. BECKER: Yes, I mean absent -- I meant to say I've never seen a condition where the defendant's right to speak with his co-defendant was fettered in that manner. And if I could just give the Court a little background.

I've been in many cases, including currently, involving violent gang members, who are all incarcerated, either at the MDC or the MCC in multiple gang cases. There is no prohibition against them speaking with one another.

The right to confer with their fellow defendants, I respectfully submit, implicates their First Amendment right of

association. It is one of the foundations of our society. It is the right of individuals to combine with other persons in pursuit of a common goal by lawful means. That's a Supreme Court decision in NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co.

The statute, your Honor, authorizes the Court to impose the least restrictive condition of bail that is necessary to reasonably assure the defendant's appearance and the safety of the community. So absent some particularized showing why the defendant's appearance and the safety of the community cannot be reasonably assured, absent the imposition of that condition, I would respectfully submit that it should not be a condition.

The defendant also has a due process right to speak with his fellow defendants in connection with the case, if they choose to. He's got more at stake in this case than anyone.

His Sixth Amendment right --

THE COURT: Why does he have more at stake than anyone?

MR. BECKER: Pardon me?

THE COURT: Why does he have more at stake in this case than anyone?

MR. BECKER: Because his liberty is at stake, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is he the only one?

MR. BECKER: No, I didn't mean --

THE COURT: He's not incarcerated.

MR. BECKER: I didn't mean more than his fellow -what I meant is that the interest that he has in this case is
paramount. I misspoke when I said -- forgive me. That's all I
meant.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, the Sixth Amendment provides him with the right to assistance of counsel. I'm there to assist him; he's not there to assist me. It seems to me that he has every right under the First Amendment, under due process, to speak with his co-defendants, absent some particularized showing why --

THE COURT: I take it he doesn't have a right to conspire with them to break the law, correct?

MR. BECKER: That is absolutely so, your Honor. If in speaking with his co-defendants he is found to have done that, then he is of course subject not only to revocation of bail, but he's subject of course to new charges.

But, when I think about all the cases I've been in over the years, some rather notorious, involving allegedly dangerous people, I've never seen such a condition. And I inquire whether or not this condition was imposed following due consideration by the Court and the opportunity for the parties to air out their positions. I'm not sure that it was.

THE COURT: It was not separately briefed, but there

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

certainly was a discussion.

All right. Let me hear from the government.

Mr. Becker is telling me he's had many, many cases with very dangerous people, involving physical danger, although not financial danger apparently. And this is really a foundational issue here that does not let the man exercise a variety of his Constitutional rights.

What's the response of the government?

MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I would direct your Honor's attention to the provisions in the Bail Reform Act that lay out conditions that your Honor can set. In particular, 3142(c)(iv) and 3142(c)(v).

THE COURT: Just a moment.

MS. FLETCHER: Sure.

MR. FROCCARO: Judge, would it be okay if I leave?

THE COURT: Yes, of course you may leave.

Let's follow the trail. 3142(c)(1)(v).

MS. FLETCHER: Yes.

THE COURT: And you cited another provision.

MS. FLETCHER: The one just before it, (iv).

THE COURT: If the judicial officer determines that the release described in Subsection (b) of this section, which is entitled release on personal recognizance or unsecured appearance bond.

Is that the situation here, government?

MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I don't have a statute book with me. I was not aware this issue was going to be raised. I looked these provisions up on my phone before the proceeding started. My understanding is these are examples of conditions the Court can set.

THE COURT: Let me look. If the judicial officer determines that the release described in Subsection (b), which as I say is entitled release on personal recognizance or unsecured appearance bond, will not reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required or will endanger the safety of any other person or the community, such judicial officer shall order pretrial release of the person subject to the least restrictive further condition that such judicial officer determines will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person and the community, which may include the condition that the person abide by specified restrictions on personal associations, place of abode or travel. And the other provision is avoid all contact with an alleged victim of the crime, and with a potential witness who may testify concerning the offense.

Mr. Becker, do you know if your client's released on an unsecured appearance bond?

MR. BECKER: My client is released on an appearance bond that is secured by property valued at \$100,000, is my understanding.

THE COURT: Somebody will have to follow this trail to see if there is a separate provision for those released on a secured appearance bond. This is the only thing I've been directed to. And I take it, government, your argument is the other defendants -- well, I won't make your argument.

What is your argument?

MS. FLETCHER: Yes, your Honor. So when this condition was raised to your Honor at the initial appearance, I had an opportunity to speak with all counsel for all defendants about this condition, including Mr. Froccaro. And the reason there was no discussion about the reason for the condition is that all of the defendants consented to it, but I am happy to explain why, in the government's view, a prohibition on Mr. Ketabchi's ability to associate with his co-defendants is particularly appropriate and still satisfies the Bail Reform Act's requirement that the Court impose only the least restrictive conditions.

My request for this condition in particular was because in connection with the arrests of the six defendants on March 21 of this year, I learned from more than one person who was present when Mr. Ketabchi was in a room with his co-defendants that Mr. Ketabchi said, in no uncertain terms to his co-defendants --

THE COURT: We're talking about this Mr. Ketabchi.
MS. FLETCHER: This Mr. Ketabchi, not his brother,

who, yes, is one of his co-defendants. This Mr. Ketabchi.

That he said to his co-defendants, and I won't use the exact words that he used --

THE COURT: We're big people here, and we've read lots of tweets, so why don't you tell me in exact words.

MS. FLETCHER: I'm not sure I can say the F word in your Honor's presence. But my understanding is that

Mr. Ketabchi directed his co-defendants to keep their F'ing mouths shut and get their lawyers.

THE COURT: And you're representing that others who were there have represented that's what he said.

MS. FLETCHER: Yes, both law enforcement witnesses who were present and at least one of his co-defendants. So it was that, that communication that initially prompted the government to seek this condition.

And the government's view is that if, as the government expects he was doing, Mr. Ketabchi is trying to tell his co-defendants, who are at least potential witnesses in the case against him and may actually be witnesses in the case against him, not to talk, that he's essentially obstructing and intimidating witnesses.

So, your Honor will recall that I was asking your Honor to make very clear instructions that they not speak with each other precisely because of this concern.

I have since learned of additional instances of

communications between co-defendants in this case that, in the event your Honor is inclined to revise this bail condition, I'd ask for an opportunity to write to the Court about. But I can represent to your Honor that the restriction on the ability to communicate with co-defendants is primarily motivated by this Mr. Ketabchi's conduct.

THE COURT: Thank you. Sir.

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor. The conditions of bail that the government cited to your Honor, which are reflected in the statute, are certainly conditions that the Court in appropriate circumstances can impose. And those are circumstances where the Court makes a finding that, absent imposition of those conditions, the defendant's appearance in court and danger to the community cannot — you know, that he will not present a danger to the community cannot reasonably be assured. That is the touchstone that guides the Court's consideration here, whether or not the condition is necessary and whether it is the least restrictive condition to reasonably assure his appearance and safety of the community.

I submit that what the government just cited to your Honor respectfully doesn't come within a mile of that, for the following reason. First of all, if I heard the government correctly, what Mr. Ketabchi said upon arrest to his co-defendants was keep your F'ing mouth shut and get a lawyer. I suggest that was good advice. I suggest that's advice I

would have given.

The notion that someone is saying the best thing you can do is have a lawyer, the notion that that somehow is obstruction of justice or presents risk of flight or danger to the community, respectfully, I don't see a connection.

Your Honor talked about how we're all adults here and we've read tweets. Many of the tweets that we have read over the past few months are by our commander in chief who says the most outrageous things, and then the next day his spokespeople say, well, you can't take him literally.

If the Court or the government has concern that Mr. Ketabchi has said something that some skillful prosecutor might say could be touching on obstruction of justice, and I submit that comment doesn't come close, then he can be admonished and warned to not do anything like that. But his First Amendment right of association can only be taken away, your Honor, if there is a showing that it is necessary to reasonably assure his appearance and the safety of the community. And that has not even been attempted to be shown by the government.

THE COURT: Well, first of all, I don't think I was referring to any tweets by the commander in chief, as you say. What I really had in mind was the use of the F word from the erstwhile communications director of the White House in tweets, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Putting that aside, this really has nothing do with the commander in chief. It has to do with what language is appropriate in a court or in public or what isn't.

It seems to me there are really two aspects to this issue. One has to do with bail. Your point there is a restriction on who he can talk to has nothing to do with ensuring the safety of the community or the appearance of the defendant in court. I haven't thought it through in quite those terms.

Something tells me safety of the community isn't only physical safety, that it may indeed relate to safety of the community for the sake of being free from alleged financial improprieties or not impropriety, but making victims of elderly people through telemarketing, which is what the allegations are here. So I think there is at least a possibility that it could come within the bail issue.

Secondly, the issue really is whether it is an appropriate restriction separate and apart from bail. That is, is it appropriate in this case to say you can't talk to your co-defendants because there is a concern of a continuing conspiracy, or even, to use the government's phrase, I won't say obstruction of justice, but putting pressure on co-defendants not to talk, with what may be an inherent threat if that's not followed, that direction to keep your F'ing mouth

H8U3KETC shut and get a lawyer is not followed. Now, I certainly understand what you're saying is, boy, except for the F bomb, that's good advice. Don't talk to the government until you get a lawyer. That's your point. (Continued on next page)

THE COURT: As I say, I haven't thought it through.

If you wish to press this point, Mr. Becker, because I would view it as an application to alter bail conditions, if that is how you want to do it, that is perfectly fine with me. If you submit something to me in writing, the government will have an opportunity to respond so I can analyze it in the proper context. If you don't want to follow up, that is okay with me. It is entirely up to you.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, I would like to just add that the court's concern regarding whether a financial crime can come within the rubric of the interests of the community is an interesting one, but respectfully, I don't think it is particularly pertinent here because the government has not alleged that the defendant said anything suggestive of continuing the conspiracy or said anything that should give the court concern that absent this restriction, the crimes will continue and those crimes would present a danger.

THE COURT: Well, there is a suggestion by the government it was inchoate, it was additional information that I take it the government was suggesting was appropriate only in an in-camera proceeding to be disclosed. I don't know what there is out there. The government was again suggesting that they had additional information along the lines of statements Mr. Ketabchi made.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, if the government said

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ex-parte or in camera, I may have missed it.

THE COURT: No, they did not say that. That was an inference drawn by me.

MR. BECKER: You know, again what we have on the record as of this moment is nothing that would suggest a danger of continuing crimes which might then come under the rubric of danger to the community. We have nothing but someone telling his co-defendants be smart, get a lawyer, in colorful language. I open my comments by talking about defendants in violent cases who have never been subject to this restriction. I have been in many, many white collar financial crimes cases involving multiple defendants. Never once --

THE COURT: You said that several times.

MR. BECKER: I thought I said it only as to the violent. I am saying it also with respect to the financial crimes, that I haven't seen it.

THE COURT: What I gather from your statements, you view yourself as an experienced criminal defense lawyer, that is exactly why you're on the CJA panel, I appreciate that and you've never seen this before.

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.

With respect to the court's invitation to submit something in writing, while I am never shy about submitting something in writing, I think that on the state of the record as we have it, I feel comfortable that the court does not

H8UJKET2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

respectfully have a basis to impose this condition.

If anything, I think the burden should be on the government as to why it should remain in place. Unless the court is prepared to make a finding that a defendant saying to his co-defendants, "you better F'ing shut up and get a lawyer" presents a risk of flight or danger to the community, which respectfully I think would be quite a stretch, then I think the record --

THE COURT: Fair enough. I understand. Let me hear from the government.

MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I think it is more appropriate Mr. Becker make a written submission. As you noted, this is a request for modification of bail, and in the event Mr. Becker does make a submission, the government would like an opportunity to respond. I think what is happening here is Mr. Becker is hoping your Honor will, pardon the term, be bullied into changing the condition now without having the opportunity to review the written submission that I promise your Honor I would like to submit.

THE COURT: I do not in the least feel bullied. is a very interesting discussion.

MS. FLETCHER: I don't expect your Honor would feel bullied.

If anything, he is showing his bona fides THE COURT: as a CJA attorney.

H8UJKET2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. FLETCHER: He is certainly the more experienced lawyer in this area of the courtroom.

THE COURT: Don't you be bullied by his saying he has seen many, many cases. I have seen many, many lawyers who said they have seen many, many cases who have not, but that is not Mr. Becker. Enough! Enough!

Mr. Becker, you can make whatever -- I do want it in writing. You can make it whatever length you want, but I am taking this as a request to alter bail conditions, do it under that rubric, and the government will respond.

MR. BECKER: I would be happy to do so, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. I do appreciate this discussion, and nobody in my courtroom should ever feel bullied, and I quarantee you I never have.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, I hope it goes without saying that the notion that I would consider acting in a way that might be construed as bullying is eons from who I am and certainly not what I am trying to accomplish here today.

THE COURT: Enough. I will see everyone at the next scheduled conference. Actually, I don't think there is a scheduled conference.

THE CLERK: It is an argument that is scheduled.

THE COURT: There is argument scheduled on the

motions. Thank you, all.

(Court adjourned)